



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

with the maps eyeleted, and put into a loose leaf chart head, so that a map may be removed and put back at will, and mounted on a special tripod stand, costs \$24.00. In a drop front spring roller case, the set costs \$31.00.

A manual for teachers is to accompany and to explain the maps.

The five maps I have myself bought I find satisfactory. These are B 11 (names on this map are given partly in the English forms, partly in the Latin forms); B 12 (names are given mostly in English forms); B 13; B 14; and B 15.

All these maps are very helpful, and their cost puts them within reach of the individual. B 13 and B 14 are particularly satisfactory, at least to me.

One important element in the success of these maps lies in the fact that they avoid excessive detail. Further, what is given is thrown out into sharp relief. One feature of them, however, I do not like, though the authors of the Series evidently pride themselves on it—the fact that names are given largely in English. Were the names all in English, the result might be enduring. But the putting, now of Latin, now of English names on the same map, and, worse yet, the putting of both names for the same thing (e. g. for such a minor stream as the Arnus, both Arnus and Arno are given), makes a rather revolting jumble.

Even more absurd is the fact that, in the Map of Gaul, where, as a matter of fact, the names are given mostly in Latin, we have standing out in bold letters a French form, "Aquitaine".

In one matter more the publishers might, without great expense, help the users of the maps, in their cheapest and so most serviceable form. At present, the identifying letter and number appear on these maps only inside, on the bottom margin. They could easily be added on the top margin, and could be set also beside the name of the map, inside. Finally, it would be easy and most helpful to put identifying letter, number and name on the back of the map, in position to show plainly when the map is rolled up. c. k.

THE PROFITS OF LITERATURE IN ANCIENT ROME¹

The fact that ancient Rome possessed a literature is proof enough that literature was profitable. Our task, then, is simply to find out what form the profits took. This is not easy to do: we have only scattered bits of evidence to piece together, and these are capable of varying and contrary interpretation. Most students of the question have not taken into account all the evidence, or have reached their conclusions first and sought support afterwards. I shall attempt to collect here most at least of the testimony of Rome to the financial relation of author and publisher.

For the earliest times, we may doubt whether an author could count on any financial gain. Literature was not so indispensable to the early Roman that he would have made any very great effort to get books. Furthermore, there was no regularly organized book trade, and it is hard to see how any very great profit could have been derived from such hit or miss methods as were possible. The pirating of editions was always fatally easy, and, with no trade to control it, was in earlier days easier still. We must, however, recognize the existence of a book trade earlier than is commonly done. The usual statement, that there was none till the time of Sulla, overlooks a remark by Polybius (3.32). He says, in comparing his own universal history with the local or partial histories of others, that it is easier to buy his forty books, which are as it were in one piece. Polybius was of course thoroughly cosmopolitan, but it seems likely that he was thinking chiefly of Roman readers, who must then have had some means of getting books. In another passage (16.14) he mentions certain Greeks who wrote 'with no view to gain', implying that there were others (probably also Greeks) who did write with a view to gain. But it is not necessary from the context to believe that these men were writing for Roman readers, rather than for the markets of Athens or Alexandria, which, long before this, had developed book trades. For the early period, then, we can hardly assume that Roman writers could have made much money from their books. Livius Andronicus may have sold to his classes copies of his *Odyssey*, and dramatic poets may have sold their plays to the producers, but these would hardly be cases in point.

The earliest publisher of whom we have definite knowledge is Atticus. Publishing was a side line with him, yet he seems to have had a retail store in Rome (Cicero was perhaps his chief customer), and connections in Athens and elsewhere in Greece. He competed successfully with his rivals for the publication of some, at least, of Cicero's works, and it is conceivable that he published Lucretius's poem, if the tradition be correct that this was edited by Cicero. He issued, among other works, the treatises on Cato by Brutus and Hirtilius, and a series of valuable and excellent editions of Greek authors came from him². Cicero had such confidence in his judgment that he left it to him to decide when to publish the *Second Philippic* (Ad Att. 15.13.1). The financial aspect of their relation has never been made clear. Birt³ was formerly of the opinion that Cicero received a percentage on the sales of his works, but now seems to have receded somewhat from this position. The chief evidence for this opinion is a letter in which Cicero says to Atticus, *quoniam impensam fecimus in macrocolla* (Ad Att. 13.25.3). But even the use of the first person plural would not prove that expenses were ordinarily shared and the

¹This paper was read at the Tenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the Central High School, at Philadelphia, April 14, 1916.

²F. W. Hall, *Companion to Classical Texts*, 51, 230; Th. Birt, *Antike Buchwesen*, 284 f.

³*Buchwesen*, 354; compare his discussion in his revision of Müller's *Handbuch*, I, 316 ff.

receipts divided pro rata. Macrocolla were large sheets used for some special purpose, possibly for a presentation copy. Therefore, we are not justified in inferring that this was the regular arrangement between Cicero and Atticus. Even if the author did help now and then to defray the preliminary expenses, it would not prove that he would receive more than reimbursement. Another passage often used to prove that Cicero made a profit from his works is the following: *Ligarianam praeclare vendidisti. Posthac quicquid scripsero, tibi praeconium deferam* (Ad Att. 13.12.2), but this is to be interpreted in the light of another letter (Ad Att. 13.19.2), written about a week later: *Ligarianam, ut video, praeclare auctoritas tua commendavit. Vendo* is common enough in the sense of 'recommend'; cf. e. g. Ad Att. 1.16.16, 8.16.1; Horace Epp. 2.1.75. In Horace, Epp. 2.1.35, *pretium* is used in a similar figurative sense. The first edition of the *Academica* resulted in a loss for Atticus (Ad Att. 13.13.1), for which Cicero tried to console him by promising him that the second edition would be far superior in every way, but there is no suggestion in this consolation that Cicero shared the loss, nor is there any sign of financial concern on Cicero's part at all. So, if there was a percentage arrangement in this case, Cicero's profit must have been guaranteed. It is easier to believe that there was no such arrangement. In another case (Ad Att. 2.1.2), Cicero directs Atticus to have the *De Consulatu Suo* in Athens and other cities of Greece, *videtur enim posse aliquid nostris rebus lucis adferre*. There is no suggestion here of financial returns. We know of at least one case where Atticus allowed a work of Cicero to get out without the author's consent (Ad Att. 13.21 A.1), and the incident proves that in this case at least there was no very binding contract between them. A somewhat similar experience is referred to in *De Oratore* 1.5 (compare 1.94) regarding the *De Inventione*.

Cicero, therefore, gives us no reason to believe that authors were financially benefited by their labors, even if he gives no absolute proof that they were not.

Let us turn to Horace. The antecedents and early life of the poet would not suggest that he could afford to devote himself to literature unless it promised some reward. He tells us that poverty drove him to write verses (Epp. 2.2.49 ff.), and there must have been some prospect of financial success to draw to Rome such a steady stream of aspiring authors. Yet in another passage (Serm. 1.4.71), written very soon after his coming to Rome after Philippi, Horace disclaims any intention of publishing his works broadcast. Single poems, recited privately to a small circle of friends, could hardly have been a source of great profit. Their chief financial value was as advertising. It is true that later Horace had an arrangement with the *Sosii* brothers to publish his works, and from this they were to get *aera*, while Horace was content with *longum aevum* (*Ars Poetica* 345-346; Epp. 1.20.2).

The relations of Martial and his publishers are very complicated. We may safely say that, if any Roman

author made money from literature, Martial was that author. He was not likely to overlook any source of income. Yet we do not know what financial basis his dealings with his publishers had, though Birt believes he received his profits in the form of a lump sum⁴. He mentions in his poems four publishers (or booksellers) —Secundus, Pollius, Atrectus, and Trypho.

I shall mention these men in the order in which they appear in the poems. In the second epigram of the collection we now have, Martial advises travellers to buy the small handy edition of the *Epigrams*, an edition on parchment, which Secundus has on sale at his shop behind the temple of Peace. We might infer that Secundus was the publisher of this volume in the series⁵, especially if we could think of this poem as having appeared separately on the *pila* of the bookseller, like the rhyming advertisement and (identical) title page of Lowell's *Fable for Critics*, with which Putnam aptly compares Martial's poem⁶. In the same volume (1.113), we find a reference to Pollius, the publisher of the poet's youthful works. In 1.117 Lupercus, who wishes to borrow a copy of Martial's poems, is told that Atrectus, whose shop is in the Argiletum, sells the book for five denarii, a price which Lupercus naturally thinks too high. Here we have, then, three possible publishers mentioned in one book. I shall consider more fully at another time the relations of the three and the problem of different editions of Book 1, a matter somewhat freely debated in recent years. In 4.72 a borrower is referred to the bookstore of Trypho, and in 13.3 the poet says that Trypho has the *Xenia* for sale at four sesterii, but can sell it for two and still make money. The interpretation of this last remark is doubtful. We know that fixed prices were as rare in ancient Italy as in modern, but we are hardly prepared for such a suggestion as this. I venture to add to the number of explanations. Trypho was a man of consequence—to his influence we owe the publication of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*—and in my opinion a close friend of Martial. It is, therefore, good advertising that Martial is on jesting terms with the famous publisher, and the poet can make facetious remarks about his publisher's excessive profits without fear of being misunderstood—at least by his contemporaries.

Obviously none of the passages I have cited allows us to determine the financial relations existing between Martial and his publishers. A percentage basis is out of the question when we remember Martial's complaint that, even though his poems are known in distant Britain, *nescit sacculus ista meus* (11.3.6). I do not believe that we can assume even the payment of a lump sum as a regular thing. Martial himself has led many critics astray by the phrase *praemium libellorum* (10.74.7). Yet the passage proves nothing. The poet complains that, worn out by calls and social formalities,

⁴Buchwesen, 354.

⁵Compare A. P. Ball, *A Forerunner of the Advertising Agent*, *The Classical Journal*, 2.165 ff.

⁶*Authors and Their Public in Ancient Times*³, 219.

he can earn only a hundred *plumbei* in a whole day, while Scorpis gets fifteen sacks of gold for an hour's effort. 'What *praemium libellorum* do I want?' he asks. 'Not lands nor gifts, but sleep!' Another epigram (11.108) often quoted in this connection is obviously addressed to the reader, not to the publisher.

Roman law has some testimony to offer, and reveals how little notion the Roman had of the value of literary property. It is only fair, however, to say that Gaius protested against this attitude toward literature (2.78). The legal doctrine of *accessio* as a means of acquiring ownership was applied to literature as follows (Digest 41.1.9.1):

'Writing, even if in letters of gold, follows the papyrus or parchment, just as things built on land, or things planted in it, go with the soil. Thus, if I write a poem or history or oration on your papyrus or parchment, it is to be understood that you are owner, not I. But, if you want back your material and are unwilling to pay the expenses of writing, I can defend myself on a plea of fraud if I have come into the possession of the material in good faith. On the other hand, painting reverses this arrangement, and the material follows the ownership of the painting. . . .

In other words, it is the stenographer's time and the ink used that give value to a work, not the contribution of the author. The law, therefore, offered little protection to writers. The only case I know of when plagiarism was legally rebuked is reported by Vitruvius (Praefatio to Book 7), where an *actio furti* was brought before a Ptolemy. But this was at Alexandria.

The career of the publisher Dorus affords the best proof that there was any idea of literary property, yet this has no direct relation to any author. Seneca (De Beneficiis 7.6.1) calls Dorus the *emplot* of MSS of Cicero and Livy. The present tense in the passage shows that Dorus was a contemporary of Seneca (Birt is compelled to deny this) and therefore could have had no dealings with either Cicero or Livy. He probably did actually buy the MSS from earlier publishers or other owners.

What motives, then, influenced men to write? First, probably, should be mentioned the desire for fame. Cicero, in a passage quoted above, testifies to this; Pliny (Epp. 9.23) expresses his pleasure in his growing fame as a writer. Altruism is given by Cicero as the motive for writing the *Tusculans* (1.5), and the desire to serve, it is clear, influenced men like Lucretius and Livy. Catullus wrote because he could not help it. It has been suggested that authors who dedicated their books did so from a desire for gain, and that the legal title to the work was thus transferred. This is supported by such phrases as *cuius vis fieri?* (Mart. 3.2.1) and Catullus's formal *quare habe tibi* (1.8). . . . Some compensation may have been expected in return for such a compliment, even though a positive statement is impossible. It is certain that authors did expect some sort of assistance from their patrons. The relation of Horace to Maecenas was the ideal of poets like Martial. We find reflections of this even in Horace.

Thus he speaks as poet to patron when he says *et egeret vetes et scribere cogas* (Epp. 2.1.228). Trebatius tries to tempt him to write the praises of Augustus, *praemia laturus* (Serm. 2.1.12). The anecdotes of Vergil's early dealings with the Emperor reveal the parasite. Horace realized that the favor of patrons could be won only by attracting their attention: and this depended largely on the publisher. So Horace says in recognition of their power (Ars Poetica 372-373)

mediocribus esse poetis
non homines, non di, non concessere columnae.

A similar notion is found in Propertius (3.23.23). Martial uses Maecenas as a model repeatedly: thus in 1.107.3-4 he says

Otia da nobis, sed qualia fecerat olim
Maecenas Flacco Vergilioque suo.

In another passage (8.56.5-6) he says

Sint Maecenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones
Vergiliumque tibi vel tua rura dabunt.

In default of one Maecenas, Martial had to accept several. One of the most satisfactory of these casual patrons was probably Pliny, who made Martial a present for his verses, lamenting the passage of the good old days when men rewarded poets for their praise.

A much more businesslike way of securing remuneration was to publish one's own works, but the author who could afford the necessary slaves and equipment would hardly worry about compensation. The sale of the manuscript outright was probably arranged wherever possible.⁷ Such a transaction is known to have occurred in the case of Pompilius Andronicus (Suetonius De Grammaticis 8), and the elder Pliny was offered 400,000 sesterces for his Commentaries (Pliny, Epp. 3.5.17), but we do not know that either time a publisher was involved. Martial may refer to such a transaction in 12.46:

Vendunt carmina Gallus et Lupercus.
Sanos, Classice, nunc nega poetas.

Absolute ownership would then pass to the bookseller, and a poet might well remain in ignorance of the extent of the sales. So we might say with Symmachus (Epp. 1.31): *Cum semel a te profectum carmen est, ius omne posuisti; oratio publicata res libera est.*

Of these possible sources of income two were particularly important: the interest of patrons and the sale of manuscripts. These methods of deriving profits from literature will, I believe, fit all the evidence. That authors were ever paid percentages I do not believe we can prove. If the manuscript was sold, the title passed. The small size of editions and the ease of issuing unauthorized versions would have prevented any long continued profits. But, for many Romans, sufficient reward would have been the consciousness of having served their fellowmen.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

ELIAN T. SAGE.

⁷Compare H. S. Jones, *Companion to Roman History*, 337, for the same conclusion unsupported by argument or evidence.